

REMARKS

Claims 30-42 are pending. No new matter has been added.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 30-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Dandurand (“Market Niche Analysis In the Casino Gaming Industry,” Journal of Gambling Studies, Vol. 6(1), Spring 1990) in view of Acres (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0183529).

Independent claim 30 recites “assembling a second subset of attributes from the set of attributes in response to said receiving the query” “of the set of attributes”, where “the set of attributes includes demographic or preferential attributes”, as claimed. In contrast, Dandurand discloses on pages 78, 79, and 80 that:

market analysts can observe behavior of the target market customers. They will be searching for any differences that might be related to unique target market customers and to unique preferences. . . . A third approach, *the deductive approach* . . . attempts to deduce unique preferences based on existing customer profiles.

(Emphasis in original)

Dandurand does not disclose or suggest “assembling a second subset of attributes from the set of attributes in response to said receiving the query” because Dandurand discloses searching “for any differences that might be related to unique target market customers and to unique preferences” by observing “behavior of the target market customers”. In Dandurand, the “behavior of the target market customers” is observed to search for the differences. The “behavior” is not “demographic or preferential attributes”, as claimed. The behavior may be studied to determine the “demographic or preferential attributes”. However, the behavior, *per se*, is not “demographic or preferential attributes”, as claimed. Hence, for at least the reasons set forth above, Dandurand does not disclose or suggest “assembling a second subset of attributes from the set of attributes in response to said receiving the query” “of the set of attributes”, where “the set of attributes includes demographic or preferential attributes”, as claimed.

Moreover, Dandurand does not disclose or suggest “storing a set of attributes regarding a plurality of individuals in a player tracking database . . . assembling a second subset of attributes from the set of attributes in response to said receiving the query”, where “the . . . second subsets of attributes are subsets of the set of attributes”, as claimed. Rather, Dandurand discloses “attempts to deduce unique preferences based on existing customer profiles”. Such deduction suggests that the “unique preferences” are not stored in a database at the same time the “existing customer profiles” are stored. Contrarily, in claim 30, the “second subset of attributes” is a subset “of the set of attributes” stored in a “player tracking database”, as claimed. The deduction of the “unique preferences” in Dandurand from the “existing customer profiles” does not disclose or suggest that the “unique preferences” are stored in a database when the “existing customer profiles” are stored. Rather, in Dandurand, the “unique preferences” are deduced, which suggests that the unique preferences are created after the “existing customer profiles” are stored. Hence, for at least the reasons set forth above, Dandurand does not disclose or suggest “assembling a second subset of attributes from the set of attributes”, where “the . . . second subsets of attributes are subsets of the set of attributes” and “the set of attributes” are stored in a “player tracking database”, as claimed.

Moreover, Acres is not cited to cure the deficiencies in Dandurand. Rather, Acres is cited to disclose “a player tracking server” (see Office Action, page 4). Hence, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that claim 30 would not have been obvious over the combination of Dandurand and Acres.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dandurand with Acres because Dandurand does not relate to “a player tracking system” and Acres relates to “a player tracking system”. For example, Dandurand discloses a “Management Information System” (MIS) (see page 84). The disclosure of the MIS does not disclose or suggest “a player tracking system”. According to Wikipedia, available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Management_information_system and submitted herewith in an Information Disclosure Statement, “a **management information system (MIS)** is a system that provides information needed to manage organizations effectively” (Emphasis in original). There is no disclosure or suggestion that the MIS is associated with a player tracking system. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 30 would not have been obvious over the combination of Dandurand and Acres.

For at least the same reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 31-42 would not have been obvious over the combination of Dandurand and Acres.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicants hereby petition for any required fee in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No.IGT1P048).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Reginald J Suyat/
Reginald J. Suyat
Reg. No. 28,172


Nishitkumar V. Patel
Reg. No. 65,546

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100